



## Flood Caucus Meeting

### MEETING SUMMARY

## **CALIFORNIA WATER PLAN: UPDATE 2013**

### **FLOOD CAUCUS MEETING**

**FEBRUARY 2, 2012 2:00 P.M – 4:45 P.M.**

**CALEMA, SACRAMENTO, CA 95814**

#### **Meeting Purpose:**

The California Water Plan (CWP) Flood Caucus is a statewide topic-based workgroup designed to support development of CWP Update 2013 through in-depth discussions and deliberations of integrated flood management topics and issues. The Integrated Flood Management (IFM) Caucus will identify and expand information associated with integrated flood management related to statewide and regional needs, opportunities and challenges. Meeting materials can be found online here:

<http://www.waterplan.water.ca.gov/materials/index.cfm?subject=feb0212>

#### **Meeting Goals:**

To discuss the role of the Caucus in Update of CWP Update 2013 Resource Management Strategy, prepare the flood portion of the Regional Reports, and Preparing of the Progress Report; and to provide a status update of the Flood Future Report.

#### **Attendance: (See Attached)**

#### **Action Items:**

#	Item	Owner	Due Date
1.	During the 2/2 Flood Caucus meeting, facilitator Lisa Beutler moved to adopt the Flood Caucus charter. No objections were raised at the time. If any caucus members do have objections, please send a note to Lisa Beutler.	Caucus members	Before Next Meeting
2.	Survey Monkey to go out asking for top 5 RMS's to consider, and identify individuals who would like to participate in the RMS's as liaisons from the Flood caucus. This survey will also include questions related to the Regional Reports.	Lisa Beutler, Hoa Ly, Lew Moller	?
3.	A Conference call to discuss the Flood Caucus members input for the Water Plan Progress report to be scheduled separately. It was flagged during the caucus meeting that the first agenda item for this call should be a discussion regarding which of the over 400 recommendations associated with the Water Plan RMS's should be selected to follow in the progress report.	Megan Fidell, Hoa Ly	Before Next Meeting?
4.	If you are not on the Flood caucus membership list, and would like to receive the survey, talk to Lisa Beutler. Also if you don't see yourself on the membership list, but feel you should be there, let Lisa Beutler or Terri Wegener know. If you have recommendations for other new members, please also let the Water Plan Team know.	Caucus members	Before Next Meeting
5.	Kathy Schafer (FEMA) to make information on Flood insurance costs for homeowners available to Paul Massera for use in the Finance Plan	Cathy Schafer, Paul Massera	Before Next Meeting



## Flood Caucus Meeting

---

### **Announcements:**

- Membership to this caucus is not closed. If you have recommendations for other new members, please also let the Water Plan Team know.

### **Welcome and Introductions:**

Lisa Beutler (Executive Facilitator for the California Water Plan) and Kamyar Guivetchi (Manager, DWR, Division of Statewide Integrated Water Management) began the meeting with opening remarks, an agenda review, and ground rules. Introductions were done for all meeting participants. Al Herson, Ivanka Todt, John Hopkins, and Terri Wegener (DWR) were introduced as the Co-leads of the Flood Caucus.

### **History of Flood Management in the Water Plan:**

Kamyar Guivetchi gave an overview of how flood management has become a part of the California Water Plan over the past eight years. The theme of Update 2009 was integrated water management and sustainability.

Kamyar Guivetchi began by noting that the water plan it has objectives, actions, actions, strategies. All of these can in some way fall under the 3 “I’s” - Innovation, Infrastructure, and Investments. One of our biggest themes in the Water Plan is integrating land-use planning with water management. It is a challenge with over 2000 special districts, 48 Regional water groups, and numerous cities, and counties. IFM is reflected in FloodSAFE, CVFPP, SFMP, and the Water Plan. Reducing flood risk in a way that improves ecosystems, improves water quality, and provides better emergency response. “Improve flood management” has been added to the resource management strategies. The RMS for flood has three approaches: (1) Structural approaches, (2) Land Use management, and (3) ways to prepare/respond/recover for residual risk. In preparing Update 2013, we have identified 15 distinct areas of improvement.

The presentation concluded with directions on web related resources such as the Water Plan eNews publication and CWP website, (<http://www.waterplan.water.ca.gov/index.cfm>).

### **Flood Risk Management in Update 2009:**

Terri Wegener thanked the group for their participation in helping craft the states approach towards flood management. She started by revisiting the Flood Resource Management Strategy (RMS) developed for the California Water Plan Update 2009. Terri acknowledged that many of the current caucus members had a role in developing the 2009 RMS, and thanked them. The 2009 RMS, and the Flood Future Report will be the foundational building blocks that lead into 2013. She asked the group to please take home the Flood Risk Management strategy if they had not read it, because it will help guide the process through the next year.

She continued by noting that she would like the group to expand on the Structural approaches to include “multi-objective” and conjunctive use projects; as well as traditional flood management staples like dams and levees. It could also include things like recreation. In addition to the structural approaches, there is also land use. Unwise land use decisions lead to greater risk, and



## Flood Caucus Meeting

---

greater damage. This includes flood plain function, regulation, and housing and building codes. Another major section of this RMS is disaster preparedness. Terri Wegener acknowledged Arthur Hinjosa, the head of the DWR Emergency preparedness, response and recovery department. He participates in the caucus and also is a major contributor to the Flood Future report. Under disaster preparedness, there is a big bullet for education and awareness. It is this awareness that leads to informed decisions, and that can guide the caucus's work.

### **Caucus Charter:**

Discussion of the Caucus charter began with Terri Wegener acknowledging the hard work of the caucus co – leads. She explained that Kamyar Guivetchi is the executive sponsor of the caucus and that one of the key points of the charter is that it is going to be consistent with the FloodSAFE program.

The Flood Caucus will also work with other FloodSAFE programs on achieving the deliverables laid out in the charter. This will include the group looking at portions of the Water Plan strategic vision, and finding tie-ins to flood. The three main deliverables are:

1. Update the Flood Management RMS. New title is Integrated Flood Management
2. Prepare the flood portion of the Regional Reports
3. Prepare IFM portion of the strategic vision.

The Flood Caucus also will have deliverables related to the SFMP Flood Future Report, including a review of the Administrative Draft. There is also an interface with the Water Plan progress report for this group. There is a lot of work for us to do.

Question: Regarding deliverable 2, am I correct in saying that we are commenting, not writing?

Answer: Correct, your work is limited to guidance and help incorporating content; not additional writing. We will be looking for input on content to include.

### **Introduction to the Flood Future Report:**

In the Statewide Flood Management Planning (SFMP) Approach, the team divided the approach into a series of phases. This includes a “gather information” period and a finance inventory. All of these moving parts point towards the stated Flood Future Report goal of providing recommendations. All of this work will all go before this caucus. It is important to note; the compressed timeline is because of the CVFPP.

The information gathering process visited each of the counties in the state, asking each of them to invite key voices that we should hear before developing our recommendations. This expanded to 131 agencies visits. The team started with just three pilot local agencies - Sonoma, San Bernardino Flood , and Santa Clara Valley WD who assisted the SFMP Program by allowing us to Beta test with them and look at the proposed strategies.



## Flood Caucus Meeting

---

SFMP also visited Cal EMA, USACE, and FEMA, our main partners. Almost 4,000 documents were collected in this process. There was a large parallel effort within DWR to gather information.

One of the key findings is that Flood Management in California is a complex array of agencies. Agency structure varies by both location and flooding type. Local agencies have diverse governance structures, and there is a disconnect between land use planning and flood risk. The SFMP team also found that agencies want improved coordination. This includes internal and external needs; sometimes emergency arms of agencies are not communicating with the planning side of their own organization. Locals have told the SFMP staff that they would like assistance with modeling, data gathering and sharing, and performing risk assessments. All agencies have a challenge in defining appropriate roles of agencies at each level, and integrating climate change in prediction methods, data and modeling. Emergency management was highlighted as something that needed attention and greater coordination among various state and local entities.

Terri Wegener continued her presentation by explaining the SFMP Flood Hazard Exposure Analysis; She described that very few entities have done a formal flood risk analysis. The SFMP program did an exposure to flood hazard analysis. The team wanted to present in an even handed way, who and what was at risk within the state of California. They wanted to show economic and personal safety risk broken down by different categories like counties, hydrologic region, and congressional district. The team developed results from 100 year and 500 year floodplains.

The SFMP was developed to understand California's flood management systems and strategies; especially in areas outside the Central Valley. The report wants to know and describe the status of IFM in California. The SFMP Program also wants to support local, state agency, federal, and tribal partnerships in the state. That includes work with all three U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) districts within the state. As the SFMP Program works more with the USACE, FEMA, and CALEMA, parallel coordination is happening within DWR. There are many efforts going on, so it takes significant energy and effort integrating the different parts. The two major products are the California Water Plan's Flood RMS, and the Flood Future Report.

The Flood Future Report will be a foundational document. It is not a traditional planning document. It is based upon existing and readily available information. It is a "what do we know" document. The SFMP Program strives to characterize this information in an even handed assessment of the status of IFM in California. The target audience is the legislature, with a goal of efficiently reducing flood risk. It is a guide to flood management decision making for anyone in California.

There is an important focus on climate change in the Flood Future Report. The state of the modeling and analysis on the interface of flood and climate change has not been entirely worked out. Therefore, the document will focus on more of a qualitative approach; recognizing multiple values and objectives in the pursuit of greater IFM coordination in the state.



## Flood Caucus Meeting

---

For the most part, local agencies contacted had a good understanding of IFM. Other findings included the IRWMPs typically do not include comprehensive planning for implementing projects - resulting in potential lost IFM opportunities. The Flood Future Report team has also concluded that IFM projects can leverage multiple funding sources, have a comprehensive plan in place, and have stakeholder support. The report also seeks to find challenges to IFM in the state. These include funding for O&M, mitigation and permitting/regulatory requirements. Our technical memoranda include an IFM definition, and descriptions of relationships to USACE multipurpose projects. This also includes several diverse case studies that reflect different regions of the state, and different flood hazards.

Our timeline for the Flood caucus/FFR is laid out in the caucus charter. The highlight is the Administrative Draft of the document review in April 2012. This caucus will be the SFMP Program's focus group.

Terri Wegener's detailed presentation of the Flood Future Report was followed by a Question and Answer session.

Q: Is one of the purposes to share the admin draft with our agencies and friends?

A: (Kamyar Guivetchi) The caucus is a focus group, a first level of review. Before we send to everyone, we look to the caucus to help us improve it. My suggestion is to not distribute it to the larger, general public.

Q: In the "scales" for flood risk, is watershed one of the scales?

A: (Terri Wegener) We are in a compressed timeframe, and we will circle back and consider the watersheds. At this point that they are not included but it is something we are grappling with. There are different ways to look at the world.

Q: I was a little worried about county level data. It has merit in terms of financing, but will you display below the county level?

A: (Terri Wegener) At this point the levels were county, California Water Plan hydrologic regions, legislative districts, and IRWM regions. These are the levels here for our first pass.

Q: Have you developed a real inventory of regulations/permitting challenges?

A: (Terri Wegener) That is a recommendation of the Report.

Comment: I heard your comment about communication. In each area they organize differently at local level. They all have their own emergency program. They are not however, always integrated and coordinated. In many rural counties, with lesser resources, they may be looking to the state for assistance in the area of emergency management. I just thought I would share that with you. We have different regions (at CalEMA) than you do in the water world, but we have our own vocabulary in the emergency management world.

Comment: I have to compliment you on the scale and ambition of this report.



## Flood Caucus Meeting

---

Q: When you went to the locals and interviewed, did you talk to planning directors, or environmental groups?

A: (Terri Wegener) We went specifically to flood management agencies and asked them to distribute the invitations to those involved in flood management in their area. This varied from region to region.

Q: The technical memo that you mentioned, is that going to be a part of Flood Future Report?

A: (Terri Wegener) The way we are structuring the report is light and minimal, and supported by technical memos (appendixes). IFM, Information Gathering, Finance etcetera will be the other attachments.

C: From the tribal perspective, what was your source of tribal lands within the GIS analysis?

Also, have you engaged other tribal entities that have similar data? Also, with forest fires we get “double punches” – fire followed by flash flooding. This is not always accounted for in integrated emergency management. Also, flash flooding in the desert deserves more attention. I would encourage more education, you are doing great.

C: I assume we won’t have long to review this, if you could please give us advance notice on the availability and deadline date so we don’t have a similar situation to the CVFPP that would be appreciated.

Response: (Terri Wegener) Thank you, it is a moving target.

Q: What I noticed is that your definition of mitigation in the emergency management is different than ours.

A: (Terri Wegener) We will circle back on this issue.

Q: With the emphasis in FloodSAFE considered, it didn’t seem like the ecological side was considered as much. Is there intent to do that? It is an important linkage considering the permitting issue. Floodplain areas are among the most impacted in the state. It is not unreasonable to think that these permitting issues may expand. How is that being handled?

A: (Terri Wegener) It is difficult to quantify environmental needs. We did not try to do that. It will be addressed in the IFM part of the tech memo, and in the discussion of the watershed and non structural assets.

Q: I worry that we are in a post-Katrina era. I did not hear anything about our levees that are in a state of crisis. How will these processes, identify the funding needs and strategies of distressed levees.

A: (Terri Wegener) It is a big challenge and a big effort. One of the things I would like to point out is the CVFPP which looks more specifically at levees in the SPFC. It is a separate path forward. We are the next level up from that.

### **Nexus Points:**





## Flood Caucus Meeting

---

Al Herson, one of the co-chairs of the Flood caucus, opened the presentation on Nexus points. He explained that the idea behind the resource management strategies is that they are a tool that feeds into integrated regional water management planning. One of the focuses is on implementation, and how to make the RMS's work better. The team listed on a handout the RMS's that interface with Flood. Some like land use and groundwater, are obvious. But the co-chairs would like to ask the group for input on others that could be added. The meeting participants were asked to take a minute and review these two lists.

Comment: I note that pollution prevention is not included in your list, and I think it should be added.

Comment: I would like to comment that fisheries restoration that should be included. Also, consideration of cultural sites; I would like to note the difference between natural floods, and "man-made" floods.

Response: Isn't there something on that in the tribal AC committee? There is also an outreach and education strategy. Also, one on disadvantaged communities.

Q: The first bullet talks about conjunctive management of groundwater storage. Is it talking about groundwater recharge with floodwaters? That would not work.

A: (Al Herson) That is noted, and it may not be a viable strategy for every location.

Q: In the agricultural land stewardship bullet, there are concerns about farming interacting with expanding bypasses, greater flood durations, and greater pressure on the agricultural lands with increased protection in urban areas.

A: (Al Herson) Great point, we will work with that. **(This was flagged by the facilitator as a point of further discussion)**

A: (Kamyar Guivetchi) As Terri's presentation showed, there is a lot of agricultural land exposed to flood risk. There is a strong nexus here regarding being stewards of agricultural land.

Comment: It wouldn't totally address the concerns about agriculture, but economic incentives need to be considered. Also, there is a positive effect of pollution control on agricultural lands.

Comment: Looking forward at system re-operation efforts, coordination with this group should be looked at.

Comment: I have read volume 1 and chapter 28. Where do you capture recovery issues and public safety in the RMS? I did note that I will make a comment on this later. Also, at the local level, how do you go about identifying hazards across areas and levels of management?

A: (Al Herson) Yes that is something we are looking at, and we need someone go through that issue.



## Flood Caucus Meeting

---

A: (Kamyar Guivetchi) One of the objectives of the Water Plan is specifically disaster response.

A: (Ivanka Todt) Some of these issues will come up again when we get to the regional levels.

Comment: I want to make sure that recreation is considered a RMS. Denser land-use is more successful when recreation opportunities are integrated into land use. These support public health and livability.

Comment: This relates to a sense of scale. Smaller events can be absorbed by individual watersheds. Some of these RMS's only apply to smaller watersheds. 100 year events have the ability to overwhelm these systems. Some are more consistent.

Comment: Two other RMS's are number 32 Sediment management, and number 23 Forest management. This list could go on and on, and scale and time are important factors. It would be good to focus on areas where essential messages come through.

Response (Al Herson): We want volunteers to personally get involved with the RMSs. We are considering a survey monkey to vote for the top 5 RMS's to ask people. We also have a lot of cross membership with the land use caucus. Other caucuses have opportunities to include liaisons.

Lisa Beutler noted that it is a time commitment, but not a huge one. The Water Plan team will look for caucus members to try and share the work where possible.

Kamyar Guivetchi closed the discussion by informing the participants that the Water Technology caucus has a charter posted on the website and has met once. Some work is being done already. The goal of the caucus is to come up with a strategic vision for where the state should invest in new and emerging technology. One of the challenges is that there is no existing inventory of who is working on what technology. This includes irrigation, treatment, and others. The caucus will work to create a database with the help of SME's from the RMS's to provide input on emerging technologies in their areas. The idea for Update 2013 is to show where various entities can work together, and where the state could direct funding. There are many flood tie-ins with the Technology caucus. This group also has access to the SWAN network, which has a strong overlap with the Technology caucus. For additional information on any of these efforts, please contact Kamyar Guivetchi or one of the co-chairs.

### **Finance Plan:**

Paul Massera (DWR) gave a presentation on the Finance Plan to the Flood Caucus. This is a major new feature of the Water Plan. The participants were given three handouts in a packet to help bring them up to speed; including a draft FAQ. This was a specific recommendation from the 2009 Water Plan, and that was backed up by a significant amount of interest. The Finance team is developing different packages that support the development of recommendations here as





## Flood Caucus Meeting

---

well, to help facilitate the discussion of tradeoffs in Update 2013. The team will develop recommendations on more quantitative analysis. This work plan is posted online if anyone would like to read more. This caucus will be instrumental in developing a “menu” of alternatives, and recommendations. Mr. Massera emphasized task six and task nine in the handout as main areas of review for members interested in helping out with the flood caucus.

Comment: These could include federal/state coordination. This is a good venue for that.

Comment: In your tradeoffs and discussion of financing, are you going to consider the costs to homeowners on paying for insurance now versus what would happen?

A: (Paul Massera) We have not been asked that before. To the extent that we can, that would be an important.

Q: How do we coordinate across multiple levels?

A: (Paul Massera) We do have categories of funding. One of those categories is process, regulatory tools etcetera.

Comment: We have issues because of changes in mapping, members who have lost structures due to floods have had issues getting permits to required. **(This was flagged by the facilitator as a point of further discussion)**

Comment: One of the issues was efficiency; we are not just talking about additional money and new programs. We are getting at simplifying the process for floodplain management and the regulatory process where we rethink the way we do IFM, as opposed to just finding new pockets to take money.

Response: (Paul Massera) Yes, this is an opportunity, we are working with the State Agency Steering Committee (SASC) to re-think what we are spending money on and ask those very questions as to what we should be doing moving forward. From the top down in terms of state administered activities, we are taking a look at that.

Comment: We are tackling regulatory issues through multiple approaches, including the Flood Future Report. We are looking for the low hanging fruit for flood managers, some of this work in the Flood Caucus can maybe roll up into the Finance work.

Comment: On the issue of federally recognized tribes, you may want to look at challenges or issues with their model. You would need to work with those folks on a tribe by tribe issue. In terms of non-recognized tribes, what you can look at is the funding gap; including flood recovery and protection in terms of disadvantaged communities.

Lisa Beutler closed the discussion by noting that Valeria and Danny Merkely are the co-chairs of the definitions committee and the subcommittee that will sit down and work through the definitions. That may be another area for input from caucus members.



## Flood Caucus Meeting

---

### Regional Reports:

Lew Moller (DWR) presented on the California Water Plan Regional Reports. The regional reports received feedback during the 2009 Water Plan update, and the team has been integrating that feedback into ongoing work.

Mr. Moller explained that the team has revisited the role of the regional reports within the plan, and it's objectives. A Regional Reports "storyboard" was included in the handouts provided to the meeting participants. He asked the group if they could see the content of the storyboard being able to accommodate flood management.

Is this report going to be useful to regional interests?

The water plan team is also looking at local and regional planning efforts to incorporate information. The long term implementation actions include addressing IFM opportunities and constraints, recommendations for implementation, and the consequences of inaction at the local level.

### Progress Report:

Megan Fidell (DWR) spoke the group about the California Water Plan Progress Report. The progress report is a standalone report that is issued on a counter cycle to the Water Plan. It attempts to see if the recommendations in the water plan were being implemented. It focuses primarily on the 13 objectives, and the 115 related actions. Meeting participants were provided a handout featuring the flood related items and formatted as an evaluation report card. She asked for feedback from the caucus in the form of a single joint evaluation. It will address regional concerns as well. The Progress Report team understands understand that there will be variation among responses, and that will be captured. Lew Moller will be using this information for the regional reports as well.

The three caucuses piloting this tool are Land Use, DAC, and the Flood Caucus. The team is also open to input on the actual tool. A conference call will be scheduled to go over this topic.

Comment: It looks like the RMS already has recommendations. How do we create more synergy between these and the RMS?

A: (Megan Fidell) My answer is I want to limit the scope of the report to something manageable.

Comment: I wonder if the caucuses could help and create the progress reports.

A: (Megan Fidell) That is a possibility.



## Flood Caucus Meeting

---

A: (Kamyar Guivetchi) As the Flood caucus updates this, you will have to do that evaluation. The question is; do we want to do that for over 400 recommendations associated with the RMSs?

Response: (Paul Massera) It is possible that these could be implemented in the next progress report, which will have the full 5 year window (unlike the limited time frame for this progress report).

Comment: There is a huge difference in quality in these recommendations.

Comment: FEMA has a new program called “risk map” that replaces the map modernization. The goal of risk map is to educate and promote actions that reduce flood risk for the public. FEMA has metrics that it is required to meet. We need to measure how FEMA engagement can encourage communities to take actions. A quick request is that we would like to partner with caucus members. These are available on the internet – if you Google “riskmap” and a new FEMA region 9 update at:

<http://www.bakeraecom.com/index.php/region-ix//>

As is the practice for Water Plan sessions, the meeting was **Adjourned** at the scheduled time.

---